

to 42 were then first collected, (and some of them perhaps invented). Opinions were divided on the subject, but it seems that about A. H. 70, the views of those who were against writing, got the upper hand.\* But the necessity of having written records was more and more felt, and it appears that several men (among them 'Orwah who died about A. H. 90,) repented towards the end of their days of having destroyed their writings, and whilst some of the traditionists continued even during the second century to resist the progress of a written literature, others—and among them the Khalif 'Omar b. 'Abd al'Azyz—made great efforts to preserve *hadythes* in books. In the third century the question whether it was lawful to take *hadythes* to paper was purely theoretical. Writing was so common that whatever evidence there might have been of its not being lawful, nothing could have put it down. The unfortunate system, however, of giving the *Isnáds* instead of referring to books, and of considering every *hadyth* as a whole, continued and did much mischief and causes great confusion, as I have shown in former articles.

---

*Entomological Papers—being descriptions of new Ceylon Coleoptera with such observations on their habits as appear in any way interesting.—By JOHN NIETNER, Colombo, Ceylon.*

Introductory Note—on the publication of new species under disadvantages such as describing entomologists necessarily labour under, in countries remote from the European centres of science.

I little doubt that the following descriptions of new Coleoptera will meet with anything but approbation from the entomological world at home. As, however, in spite of this anticipation of an ungracious reception I shall hardly desist from my purpose of publishing such descriptions hereafter, I may as well try to vindicate this measure by setting forth the reasons which induce me to consider

\* They may have been actuated by the spirit of 'Omar and by conscientious motives but from para. 8 and also partly from para. 12 we see that these old men who had seen the prophet were partly influenced by a childish desire to have the monopoly of information regarding him. Childish objects of this description are conspicuous throughout all the sciences of *hadyth*.

the difficulties which beset the path of the entomological author in this country as not insurmountable.

The objections raised against me will be these: considering the state the entomological literature is still in, that is to say, considering that it has not, generally speaking, been condensed into a certain limited and obtainable number of volumes as is the case in the higher branches of Zoology and Botany, that on the contrary the bulk of it consists of fragments which float without order in the misty and unfathomable ocean of scientific journals—it is next to impossible that an individual entomologist abroad should surround himself with this shapeless mass of learning and keep himself by this or other means so well informed of the details of the actual progress of the science as not to be exposed to mistakes of one kind or another, but more especially to creating synonymy in attempting to work independently. It will further be said against me that not having the facilities and the wholesome checks which arise from the diligent use of extensive and well named collections, not even having the gratification of a brother entomologist's views and opinions on doubtful cases, it will be impossible even to determine whether an insect be new or not; and from these reasons (the résumé will be) entomologists abroad should confine themselves to collecting and observing the habits of the objects of their attention, but they should never go to print with matters on which it is an impossibility for the ablest among them to be quite competent. These arguments are unfortunately too true, but still I think admit of being mitigated sufficiently to lead us to final conclusions less disheartening than the above.

First of all every entomologist gives the preference to a certain order of insects—say Coleoptera—and in this even, in almost all cases, to one or two particular families. In studying for the publication of new species under the disadvantages just mentioned, he will confine himself to this order or perhaps family. Now, although as objected above, the information existing on this particular branch is for the most part fragmentary, still there are certain families on which it has received a tangible shape from having been condensed by able hands: Burmeister's *Lamellicornia*, Dejean's *Carobidæ*, Erichson's *Staphylinidæ*, Schoenherr's *Curculionidæ*, Boheman's *Cassidæ*, Westwood's

Paussidæ, etc. as well as the latter author's general work on the families, and Lacordaire's on the genera, Coleopterorum, diligently consulted, go as guides a long way, and should, although some of them have by the rapid progress of the science grown rather antiquated, guard against a number of mistakes of a systematic nature.—As to whether a beetle be new or not, I admit that in forming an opinion on this question the entomologist situated as above will have quite as much to be guided by a certain tact (not clearly definable but understood by scientific men) as by anything else, and I am forced to concede that under any circumstances almost it is totally impossible to arrive at an *indisputable certainty* either the one way or the other. This, however, by no means excludes the possibility of his forming an opinion with so much precision as to enable him to pronounce on the matter with a very *high degree of confidence and all probability* in his favour. In attempting to come to a decision on this difficult point he will receive a first superficial idea from careful reflection on certain accidental circumstances such as size, scarcity, or other peculiarities of the insect in question. This idea, which ever way it may incline, will then either gain or lose in strength by diligent reference to his library, until at length, with a certain amount of tact and judgment, he will arrive at a result, which under such circumstances must carry much weight with it. I shall illustrate this case by an example: If for instance after collecting five years in Ceylon generally and in the Colombo District more especially, I find at the latter place an insect—say the *Chlænium* 5 *maculatus* described below—for the first time—am I not entitled to consider it as very scarce? If, on consulting my library, I discover nothing which can possibly refer to it (finding that not a single *Chlænium* is marked as occurring in Ceylon), are not the chances greatly in favour of its being an undescribed species? If again I collect beetles as small and inconspicuous as the *Trichopteryx* described below, and consider at the same time that, although they are in certain localities of common occurrence, no professional Coleopterologist has ever collected before me in this Island; if moreover again my library offers nothing that could possibly refer to them individually (there being hardly an Asiatic species mentioned),—am I not under these circumstances justified in consider-

ing them as undescribed? Decidedly I am. Circumstances like these would indeed be altogether conclusive, if there was not a chance of the beetle's occurring in some neighbouring country and its having thence found its way into the normal collections of Europe. The possibility of such being the case enhances the difficulties of the case of course very materially, but I do not see why they should not, to a certain degree, be overcome by the same or similar means as those cited for overcoming them in one particular country.

I think I have said enough to show that the disadvantages the entomologist encounters here, or in other places similarly situated, in *conscientiously* attempting to publish new species, may (his principal assistance being perseverance, a good library and tact—entomological instinct I am almost tempted to call it) be overcome—I am far from saying *entirely*—but so far as not to expose him, from *want* of resources in the execution of his plan, to *more mistakes* than entomologists expose themselves to under more favourable circumstances by *neglecting them*.—But I am not satisfied with obtaining the simple grant of permission to describe on the spot a part of what he collects—I claim more for the entomologist abroad: I wish to show that he should naturally be expected—nay desired—to do so, for although he labours under distressing disadvantages in some respects, he happily enjoys a proportionate share of advantages in others.—It is unsatisfactory in the extreme for an enthusiastic entomologist to be obliged to let his collections go out of his own hands, and see others reap the honours from them, which are to be reaped on such occasions, or perhaps see as it were a gulf close over them, hear no more of them, and find himself forgotten. For what is a mere collector? Let him display as much industry as possible, he is hardly looked upon as an entomologist, certainly, as long as he is prevented from publishing anything, not as a scientific one. Now, if such a man merely desists from publishing the fruits of his researches from want of resources to assist him to go creditably through such a task, if he suffers his collections to go out of his hands, because he is too true a lover of science not to see the credit, in a great measure due to himself, reaped rather by another than to hoard up his entomological treasures, a useless heap, eventually to be destroyed by moths and time—I say, that a man who acts upon

principles like these finds himself not seldom disheartened in the prosecution of his studies under difficulties such as I have set forth. If, however, as I have endeavoured to point out, these difficulties can be overcome to a very considerable extent, is anything more natural but that he should be the herald of his discoveries himself? Could anything be more unkind and ungenerous on the part of his scientific brethren at home, than to oppose and discourage him by their disapprobation? I might enlarge on this subject, which has been a sore one with me for a long time, to a great extent, but I think this is sufficient to direct the reader into the train of my ideas and to enable him to follow it up.

I hasten therefore to conclude. As mentioned above, the tropical entomologist has a proportionate share of advantages to balance what falls to his lot of the contrary; one of these advantages which he has over his brethren at home is that he has an opportunity of seeing and studying alive, what can at home only be examined in a state differing more or less from that of life. Therefore, if he is *enabled* and *expected* to describe new species, it is moreover *highly desirable*, for the sake of the promulgation of *sound* information, that he should do so; that he should avail himself of this, his principal advantage, and describe fresh from nature as many of his favourites and their habits as possible; and discouraging him in such an undertaking, on any of the above grounds, would be discouraging the progress of science in general.

FAM. CARABIDÆ, TRIB. CHLÆNIDÆ.

1. *Chlænius Ceylanicus*. N.

C. subellipticus, subconvexus, glaberrimus, nitidus; supra brunneo-æneus, capite, thoracis elytrorumque margine aureo-viridibus; subtus piceus, margine, pedibus oreque dilute castaneis. Long. corp.  $5\frac{3}{4}$  lin.

Caput ante oculos 2-impressum. Antennæ art. 3<sup>o</sup> quarto paulo longiore. Mentum dente magno excavato. Thorax subquadratus, latitudine parum longior, obsolete punctulatus, antice subconvexus, lateribus deflexus postice, depressus, planus, 2-impressus. Elytra subtiliter striato-punctata, obsoletissime punctulata.

In stagnorum ripis inter arundines habitat, in prov. occid. et merid. infrequenter legi. Per occasionem nocte ad lumen advolat.

A handsome and interesting species, distinguished as well by its general shape, which is more elliptic and convex than usual, as by its polished surface. The head is oblong and, with the exception of the mouth the parts of which are of a deep brown, of a bright metallic green divided longitudinally by a streak of copper color. The thorax is rather longer than broad, round in front and flat behind and finely punctured all over; it is of a brownish metallic color bordered laterally with bright green. The elytra are of the same color as the thorax, the same bright green stripe running along the sides. The margin, properly speaking, is deep brown. They are impressed with rows of fine indistinct punctures and with the usual series of larger setigerous ones within the margin. They are rather narrowed near the apex.

The female, in addition to having the anterior tarsi not dilated, has the basal impression of the thorax of a somewhat semicircular shape, and is broader in the body than the male.

2. *Chlœnius 5-maculatus*. *N.*

C. præcedente major, minus convexus, latior, rugosus, pubescens; supra obscure nigro-viridis, capite viridi-æneo, nitente, glabro, elytris maculis 5-flavis; subtus piceus, pedibus, elytrorum margine antennisque flavis, ore thoracisque margine magis minusve brunneis. Long. corp.  $6\frac{1}{2}$  lin.

Caput ante oculos leviter 2-impressum, punctulatum. Antennæ art. 3<sup>o</sup> quarto plus sesqui longiore. Thorax subquadrato-rotundatus, latitudine haud brevior, dorso planus, ad basin 2-impressus, rugosus, pilosus. Elytra subdepressa, subtiliter striata, rugosa, pilosa, maculis 2 humeralibus, 2 intermediis, 1 apicali flavis ornata.

Specimen singulum m. in lacus Colombensis ripis sub graminibus putrescentibus legi.

Not less distinguished than the former, especially by the rounded shape of the thorax and the 5 yellowish spots with which the elytra are adorned. These are arranged in the following manner: 2 small ones at the shoulders, 2 large transverse ones at the middle stretching from the external margin towards the suture reaching, however, but little more than half across, 1 at the apex; this is of the shape of a hammer, and half in one and half in the other elytron. The palpi appear to me longer and more markedly elbowed at the joints

than is usual with insects of this genus, the last joint is deeply excavated at the tip. The thorax is of sub-orbicular form, the back and hind part are flat, the sides slightly depressed, the margin sharp, the basal impressions very near the angles; it is, as are also the elytra, rough and finally pubescent, the striæ of the latter being thereby rendered obsolete. Legs of m. stout, anterior tarsi strongly dilated.

3. *Chlænium pulcher*. N.

C. elongatus, subconvexus, subglabratus, æneo-viridis, elytris obscurioribus, limbo pedibusque flavis, subtus piceus. Long. corp.  $6\frac{3}{4}$  lin.

Caput oblongum nitidissimum, ante oculos 2-impressum. Mentum dente fortiter excavato. Antennæ art. 3<sup>o</sup> quarto sesqui longiore. Thorax oblongus basin versus angustatus, parce punctulatus, antice lateribus deflexus, postice dorsoque planus, basi 2-impressus. Elytra striata, ad strias, præcipue apicem versus, subtilissime pilosa, flavo-marginata. Pedes flavi, spinulis castaneis. Abdomen flavo-marginatum.

Specimen singulum m. in ripis Maha-Oyæ fluminis prope Negombo cepi.

Distinguished by its elongate shape. The head is of a bright green color with the labrum and the mandibles of a deep, and the antennæ and palpi of a light brown, the latter being darkened towards the end. The thorax is of the same color as the head reflecting a copper hue from the back, its anterior angles are obtuse, the basal ones being right. The elytra are of the same greenish copper color but darker, they are impressed with longitudinal lines, which are bordered on each side by a row of minute hairs. They as well as the abdomen have yellowish margin.

4. *Chlænium cupricollis*. N.

C. subconvexus, subglabratus, capite thoraceque cupreis, elytris nigro-æneis, limbo pedibusque flavis, subtus piceus. Long. corp. m.  $5\frac{3}{4}$  f.  $6\frac{1}{4}$  lin.

Præcedenti affinis. Caput ante oculos indistincte 2-impressum. Thorax ut in præcedente sed minor, antice lateribus magis deflexus, linea media impressionibusque basalibus longitudinalibus, præcipue

in f., profundioribus. Pedes flavi, trochanteribus spinulisque castaneis. Elytra præcedentis.

In prov. occid. flaminum lacuumque ripis infrequenter legi.

Allied to the former, but easily distinguished by size, color and sculpture of the thorax. The male is shorter and the female plumper than the former. The thorax is smaller and, as is also the head, of a bright copper color with greenish sides, its impressions, especially in the female, are deeper and its anterior part laterally more deflexed. Moreover the yellowish margin of the abdomen is wanting and the tooth of the mentum is not excavated. The elytra, antennæ and palpi are, making allowances for size, etc., those of the former.

5. *Chlænius rugulosus*. N.

C. subconvexus, subglabratus, thorace occipiteque rugulosis cupreis, elytris nigro-viridibus, pedibus, elytrorum limbo lunulisque apicalibus flavis, subtus piceus, abdomine apice margineque flavis. Long. corp.  $6\frac{1}{4}$  lin.

Caput fronte 2-impressum, subtilissime longitudinaliter rugulosum. Menti dens laciniis extus rotundatis. Thorax lateribus rotundatus, deflexus, basi sat fortiter angustatus, obsolete 2-impressus, parce punctatus, subtiliter transversim rugulosus. Elytra ut in præcedente sed apice utrinque lunula flava signata, ad strias distinctius pilosa, his apicem versus per paria coeuntibus. Pectus abdomenque picea, hoc segmentis 2 ultimis, præcedente dimidio margineque flavis.

Specimen unicum f. in Ch. pulchri N. societate cepi.

Of the general appearance of the preceding two species. The head finely longitudinally, the thorax transversely rugose; the latter with rounded and deflexed sides. The mandibles are of deep brown, the palpi and antennæ of yellowish color darkened towards the tip. The lobes of the mentum tooth are externally rounded. The elytra are marked by two subapical spots of yellowish color and semi lunar shape (the back of the lunules being turned towards the suture). The striæ verge near the apex by twos into each other. The abdomen is distinguished by having a yellow margin and apex.

## TRIB. SCARITIDÆ.

6. *Scarites minor*. N.

*S. elongatus*, niger, nitidus, subtus nigro piceus, pedibus piceis, tarsis, antennis, palpisque castaneis. Long. corp. 5 lin. lat.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lin.

Caput subquadratum, ante oculos 2-impressum, pone irregulariter sulcatulum. Mentum rugosum, medio costatum, lateribus utrinque profunde uni-sulcatum, lobis obtusis, dente forti, lobis paulo brevior. Maxillæ validæ, breves, apice extus leviter arcuatæ et excavatæ, subacuminatæ. Mandibulæ validæ, inter medium et basin fortiter dilatatæ, obtuse dentatæ, dextera dente obtuso subapicali, supra subtusque longitudinaliter sulcatæ. Antennæ art. 1<sup>o</sup> sequentium trium—2<sup>o</sup> tertii prope longitudine. Thorax oblongo-quadratus, angulis anterioribus obtusis, posterioribus oblique truncatis, anguste marginatus. Elytra thoracis capitisque prope longitudine, striata, ante medium ad striam 2<sup>m</sup> uni—apicem versus ad striam 3<sup>m</sup>. 2-punctata, punctis piliferis, basi granulata, angulis oblique-truncatis, anguste marginata. Pedes anteriores tibiis apice extus 5 dentatis, dentibus 2 ultimis parvis, omnes tarsis subtus leviter excavatis.

In prov. occid. arenis humidis sub vegetabilibus putrescentibus specimina nonnulla legi.

Scarce; but little distinguished excepting by its size, for which reason, a lengthened description becomes necessary. The head is subquadrate, in front with 2 deep longitudinal impressions behind the eyes finely sulcated. The labrum is of the usual shape, the eyes are not very prominent; the antennæ are of about the same length as the head, the first joint is about as long as the 3 following together, the 2nd, which is generally longer than the 3rd, is in this case of the same length, joints 1—4 are naked, 5—11 pilose, increasing towards the tip gradually in size and thickness, taking at the same time a subquadratic and depressed shape. The mandibles are strong, much dilated and dentated from before the middle to the base, the right one having an additional subapical tooth. The maxillæ also are strong, but slightly bent at the apex, where they are also slightly excavated. The labial palpi have the last joint longer than the 3rd, elongated and elliptic. The thorax is oblong with the basal angles obliquely truncated. The elytra are oval, striated, granulated at the base, and have, as has also the thorax, a

narrow margin. The anterior tarsi are furnished externally with 5 teeth, the 2 last ones of which, however, are very small, the posterior legs are similarly provided, but the teeth are indistinct. The joints of the tarsi are slightly excavated below. The sides of the body below are rugose.

7. *Clivina rugosifrons*. N.

C. ferruginea, capite thorace abdomineque piceis. Long. corp.  $4\frac{1}{3}$  lin. lat.  $1\frac{1}{3}$  lin.

Caput rugosum, inter oculos elevatum, elevatione plana antice profunde 1-impressa. Mentum lobis subtiliter sulcatis. Antennæ robustæ, thoracis medium vix attingentes, art. ultimo elongato, penultimo—, art. 2<sup>o</sup> tertio sesqui longiore. Thorax subquadratus, antice parum angustatus, elytrorum latitudine, subtus parce punctatus, prosterno sulcato. Elytra striata, in striis punctata. Pedes tibiis anterioribus apice extus 4 dentatis, subtus excavatis, tibiis reliquis fortiter spinosis, tarsis articulis margine apicali setoso.

In prov. occid. sub vegetabilibus putrescentibus infrequentissime legi.

A large and distinguished species. The head is very rugose, the clypeus is contracted behind the apical angles and then produced again into another pair of angles. The labrum is transverse, slightly sinuate in front, with the angles rounded and setose. The mentum is quadrate, the lobes rounded at the apex and slightly sulcated, the tooth is strong, of equal length with the lobes and of the typical spear-headed form. The ligula has the apical angle much elongated, terminating in a membranaceous bristle which is bifurcate at the tip. The maxillary palpi have the last joint elongate, cylindrico-conic; that of the labial ones is still more elongate, elliptic. The antennæ have the basal joints elongate, those towards the tip rounded. They and the legs are hairy, otherwise the insect is of a bright polished surface.

8. *Clivina elongatula*. N.

C. elongata, subdepressa, supra nigro-picea, subtus picea, pedibus elytrorumque margine castaneis, antennis oreque dilutioribus. Long. corp. vix 3 lin. lat.  $\frac{3}{4}$  lin.

Caput triangulare, subtiliter punctato-rugosum. Palpi articulo ultimo apice leviter truncato. Thorax oblonge quadratus, ante

apicem leviter sinuosus, parce obsoleteque transversim strigosus. Elytra striata, in striis punctata, ad striam 3<sup>m</sup> utrinque 4 punctata. Subtus parce punctata.

Ubi præcedentem specimen singulum legi.

I have not dissected the labium of this species, which, however, is at once recognised by its depressed and, in proportion to its width, very long shape. The labrum, antennæ and legs are so much like those of the former that they need no further description. The bristle of the ligula appears simple.

9. *Olivina maculata*. N.

C. picea, elytris ferrugineis infra medium macula nigra indistincte ornatis, pedibus intermed. et post. oreque brunneo-testaceis, pedibus ant. antennisque obscurioribus. Long. corp. 2 lin.

Caput oblonge quadratum, rugosum, costis 5 magis minusve interruptis ad marginem anteriorem dentibus 4 productis munitum. Palpi art. ultimo basi intus incrassato. Antennæ art. 2-3 subæqualibus. Thorax subquadratus leviter rotundatus. Elytra striata in striis profunde punctata.

Ubi præcedentes specimen singulum legi.

As distinguished as the preceding two species. The palpi and the mentum appear to me of a somewhat extraordinary form. The last joint of the former is considerably more inflated at the base than in any other Ceylon species that has hitherto come under my notice, whilst the others are of a very curved appearance in both the maxillary and labial palpi. The emargination of the mentum would at first sight appear to be of simular shape. However, it is only the lower margin which has this form, the oblique truncature which forms the emargination being such as to give it that shape. The tooth is but of the typical shape standing on a level with the lower margin, it stands at a small angle with respect to the inclined plane formed by the rest of the truncature. The apical angles of the lobes are somewhat pyramidal, being formed by 3 sides. I have not dissected the labium, and therefore do not know whether the remaining parts exhibit any peculiarities. The insect is, however, easily distinguished by its general facies, which is rather like that of a *Dyschirius*, from which genus, however, the mentum alone is

sufficient to separate it. I may as well remark here that, although the Island is well supplied with Scarites and Clivinas, I have hitherto not discovered a single Dyschirius, a genus so well represented in Europe. Of the 3 Clivinas just described single specimens only have been in my possession for a considerable time. There are 3 or 4 more species met with about Colombo but these being of common occurrence I abstain from describing them here as they may possibly be amongst those described by Putzeys or others from the Indian continent.

FAM. RHIPIPHORIDES.

10. *Rhipiphorus tropicus*. N.

*R. niger*, nitidus, elytris albidis, nigro-maculatis, labro, palpis, antennis (pectine nigrescente excepto), unguibusque brunneis, impresso-punctatus, punctis magnis sed non profundis, subtus suborbicularibus piliferis, supra oblongis lævibus. Long. corp.  $2\frac{1}{3}$  lin. lat. ad humeros  $\frac{3}{4}$  lin.

Caput oblongum, latitudine paulo longius, parte frontis inferiore dense profundeque punctata, vertice obtuse obconico glabro, nitidissimo, occipite piloso. Thorax elevatus, ad basin 2-impressus, medio angulo obtuso, apice excavato, glabro, inter elytra producto. Elytra ad suturam utrinque stria lata brunnea punctata impressa, acuminata, apice dehiscentia, albida vel subhyalina, apicibus, medio utrinque et ad basin nigro-maculata. Alæ apice fuscæ. Pedes tarsi anticis art. 2-4. unguibusque bifidis omnibus brunneis, tarsi subtus setosis, anticis, art. 2—3 primoque apice, subtiliter sericeopenicillatis.

Specimen singulum m. prope Colombo in floribus legi. De metamorphosi adhuc nihil constat.

The head is rather long in proportion to its width, the occiput is narrowed, short obconic. The hind part of the thorax is elevated above the elytra. The central part of its base is prolonged between the elytra in an obtuse angle, the apex of which is abruptly truncated, excavated and polished. The labrum is hairy and the ungues of the tarsi bifid as usual.

The tibiæ of the interior legs are furnished at the apex with one, those of the 4 posterior legs with two spurs. The anterior tarsi

have joints 2-4 brown. The tarsi are setose below joints 2-3, the apex of the first of the anterior ones wearing fine yellowish silky brushes instead.

All over the island the Rhipiphorides and Mordellina appear to be very scarce, with the exception of 1 or 2 species of *Anaspis* which are not seldom taken in flowers. Still I recollect having met with about 7 species, including 2 large Mordellas, which, however, I have not been fortunate enough to catch as yet.

FAM. STAPHYLINID. TRIB. PINOPHILINI.

11. *Edichirus alatus*. N.

Æ. *alatus*, setosus, nitidus, rufo-testaceus, thorace dilutiore, capite, elytris abdominisque segmentis 3 ultimis nigris; elytris apice 2-maculatis, maculis rufo testaceis; pedibus flavis, femoribus apice tibiisque basi nigrescentibus; antennis palpisque maxill. basi obscuris, apice testaceis, reliquis oris partibus rufo-piceis. Long. corp. 3  $\frac{1}{6}$  lin.

Æ. *Pæderino* Er. *simillimus*, præter colorum distributionem differt tamen *alis*, elytrorum sculptura, antennarumque articulo ultimo. Antennæ art. ultimo penultimo æquali nisi paulo minore, apice fortiter *truncato* leviterque excavato. Thorax Æ. *Pæderini*, dorso punctis biseriatis impressus, serie interna vel centrali elliptica punctis minoribus magis inter se approximatis, externa vel submarginali punctis magnis distantibus. Elytra oblonge subquadrata, infra medium rotundata, thorace *longiora* et fere duplo ampliora (utrumque elytron thoracis fere magnitudine), basi parte thoracis adjacentē *duplo*—infra medium illius latitudine antica plus tertia parte latiora. Os, pedes et abdomen Æ. *Pæderimi*.

*Pæderorum* more victitare videtur; in eorum societate in lacus Colombensis ripis infrequentissime legi; illis minus gracilis atque minus agilis.

I have not had an opportunity of examining specimens of either of the 3 Æ. *dichiri* hitherto described. However, I have before me Erichson's figure and description of the Sicilian Æ. *Pæderinus* with which I find my species strongly to agree.

It differs, however from the former materially in the following 3 points, viz. the wings, the sculpture of the wing-covers and the last

antennal joint.—The fact that this species has wings would render an alteration in Erichson's diagnosis of the genus necessary it being characterized therein as apterous. The elytra are not so much contracted and rounded at the base, and, being longer than the thorax, have therefore a more oblong, subquadratic appearance. As in the above typical species they are, however, rounded at the sides and broadest a little below the middle. They are about twice as broad at the base as the adjoining part of the thorax and in their broadest part rather more than a third wider than the broadest part of the thorax. The third point in which the two species differ is the last joint of the antennæ which in this case is strongly truncated at the tip and slightly excavated. They are further distinguished by the distribution of the colors, my species being of dark yellowish red, thorax lighter, head, elytra and 3 last abdominal segments black, elytra with 2 reddish spots at the apex, legs yellowish, at the apex of the femora and base of the tibiæ blackish, the mouth is brown, the maxill. palpi yellowish with the 3 first joints dark at the base, the antennæ have the 6 basal joints dark excepting at the apex, where they, as well as the 5 remaining ones, are yellowish. In all other points I find the insect to agree entirely with the typical *Æ. Pæderinus*: the palpi, legs and anal segment of the abdomen are of the same structure, the hairy vestiture is exactly the same in the different parts of the body of my species as it is in the corresponding ones of Erichson's.

It is perhaps wrong in me to describe an isolated species of this extensive and difficult family. However, the gen. *Ædichirus* is one so extraordinary that I am sure it will be noticed wherever the description of a new species of it may be found, be it by itself or amongst those of other Staphylinidæ. The case would be different if the object of the description were a *Homalota* or the like.

---